UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AGERE SYSTEMS INC.,

Plaintiff,

Case Number: 02-CV-864

V.

ATMEL CORPORATION,

Hon. Legrome D. Davis

Defendant.

ATMEL CORPORATION'S RENEWED MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT AS A
MATTER OF LAW PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 50(b)

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b), defendant ATMEL CORPORATION ("Atmel") hereby renews several of the motions for judgment as a matter of law that Atmel made – pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a) – at the close of all evidence in the recently-concluded trial. Specifically, Atmel moves this Court for an Order granting its motions for judgment as a matter of law that:

- Claims 1, 5 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,126 ("the '126 patent") are invalid for lack of enablement (see 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 134:1-23);
- Claims 1, 5 and 6 of the '126 patent are invalid as inoperable (see 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 134:1-6, 134:24 – 135:9);
- 3. Claims 1, 5 and 6 of the '126 patent are invalid as indefinite in their use of the claim term "said opening" (see 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 134:1-3, 135:10-17);

- 4. Agere failed to establish that any Atmel process infringes claims 4 or 5 of U.S.

 Patent No. 5,227,335 ("the '335 patent"), either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents (see 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 138:5-21);
- 5. Claims 1-6 and 11 of the '335 patent are invalid for obviousness, based on each of the following references in light of the scope and content of the prior art and/or the level of ordinary skill in the art: U.S. Patent No. 4,640,004; U.S. Patent No. 4,920,071; IBM's "Process A"; IBM's "Process B"; the Suguro reference" (see generally 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 140:2 143:2); and
- 6. Agere cannot rely on the alleged commercial success of any of its own products to support its contention that the '335 patent is non-obvious, nor can it rely on any such alleged commercial success to support a contention that any of the other patents-in-suit is non-obvious (see 3/18/05 Trial Transcript at 133:15-25).

Atmel also asks the Court to grant such further relief as it deems necessary and appropriate.

¹ Suguro et al., "High Aspect Ratio Filling with CVD Tungsten for Multi-Level Interconnection," Extended Abstracts of the 18th (1986) Int'l Conf. on Solid State Devices and Materials, p. 503.

Atmel bases its request for relief on these Renewed Motions, the memorandum in support of these Renewed Motions (to be filed on April 22, 2005), and such other materials or argument as the Court may permit. Atmel reserves the right to withdraw, on or before the date on which it files its memorandum in support of its Renewed Motions, any of the specific motions identified above.

Dated: April 5, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Morse

Gregory P. Miller
Miller Alfano & Raspant

Miller, Alfano & Raspanti, P.C. 1818 Market St., Suite 3402

Munace A. Morse/ACL

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Telephone: (212) 972-6400

Robert T. Haslam

Paul Alexander

Nitin Subhedar

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe

275 Middlefield Road

Menlo Park, CA 94025-3506

Telephone: (650) 324-7000

Facsimile: (650) 324-0638

Attorneys for ATMEL CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michael A. Morse, Esquire, hereby certify on this 5th day of April, 2005, that a copy of the foregoing pleading Atmel Corporation's Renewed Motions for Judgment as a Matter of Law Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b), has been served upon the following persons in the manner indicated below:

VIA FAX AND HAND DELIVERY

Paul J. Kennedy, Esquire Pepper Hamilton LLP 3000 Two Logan Square Eighteenth and Arch Streets Philadelphia, PA 19103-2799

VIA FAX AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Thomas D. Pease, Esquire Kirkland & Ellis LLP Citigroup Center 153 East 53rd Street New York, NY 10022-4611

Attorneys for Plaintiff
AGERE Systems, Inc. and
AGERE Systems Guardian Corporation

MILLER, ALFANO & RASPANTI, P.C.

By:

Michael A. Morse/Acc MICHAEL A. MORSE, ESQ. (MM761) 1818 Market Street, Suite 3402

Philadelphia, PA 19103

(215) 972-6400

Attorney for Defendant ATMEL Corporation